



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/102,238	06/22/1998	KENICHI KUBO	B208-967 1575	
26272 75	12/08/2003		EXAMINER	
ROBIN BLECKER & DALEY			VILLECCO, JOHN M	
2ND FLOOR 330 MADISON AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10017			2612	
			DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003	19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action		09/102,238	KUBO ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit	_		
		John M. Villecco	2612			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	_		
There final records	REPLY FILED 02 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE fore, further action by the applicant is required to a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 tion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in a specific application at the specific application (a) a time (a) a time (b) and (b) are the content application (b) and (b) are the content application (c) are	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
_		PLY [check either a) or b)]				
have be 37 CFF		isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee the index the fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	ì		
	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	This are the maining date of the imalification	etori, ever il uniciy ilica, may reduce ary			
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI					
2. 🛛	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) 🗵 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(0	they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying th	e		
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.🖂	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the			
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7.⊠	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
	Claim(s) allowed: 9,11,13 and 15.					
	Claim(s) objected to:					
	Claim(s) rejected: 8,10,12 and 14.					
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.	The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· _			
10.	Other:	SUPERVI	JENDY R. GARBER SORY PATENT EXAMINER NOLOGY CENTER 2600			

Application No.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/102,238





Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has amended claim 8 to include the limitation of "a restriction to said rotary operation member is abolished". This new limitation raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 8, applicant argues that it would not have been inherent that the position of the lens is not moved when changing operating modes. However, the examiner continues to believe that it would have been inherent that the position of the lens in Kaneko would not be changed since any change in the position of the lens would cause an out-of-focus image to be projected onto the face of an image sensor. Therefore, the rejections from the previou action will be continued.